


AD-A185 222 PURE DEPHASING OF A VIBRATIONAL ADDEND(U) STATE UNIV OF 1/1  
NEW YORK AT BUFFALO DEPT OF CHEMISTRY  
S VAN SMALEN ET AL. AUG 87 UBUFFALO/DC/87/TR-49  
UNCLASSIFIED N00014-86-C-0043 F/G 20/5 NL

END  
H/7  
D/R



DTIC FILE COPY

12

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Contract N00014-86-0043

TECHNICAL REPORT No. 49

Pure Dephasing of a Vibrational Adbond

by

Sander van Smaalen and Thomas F. George

Prepared for Publication

in

Journal of Chemical Physics

Departments of Chemistry and Physics  
State University of New York at Buffalo  
Buffalo, New York 14260

August 1987

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the  
United States Government.

This document has been approved for public release and sale;  
its distribution is unlimited.

DTIC  
ELECTE  
SEP 23 1987  
S D  
CKD

AD-A185 222

87 915 10

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE

AD-A185 222

## REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) UBUFFALO/DC/87/TR-49			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Depts. Chemistry & Physics State University of New York		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Fronczak Hall, Amherst Campus Buffalo, New York 14260			7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217		
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER Contract N00014-86-0043		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Chemistry Program 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217			10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.		
			PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.
11. TITLE Pure Dephasing of a Vibrational Adbond					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Sander van Smaalen and Thomas F. George					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) August 1987	
				15. PAGE COUNT 39	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Prepared for publication in Journal of Chemical Physics					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.	PURE DEPHASING		
			VIBRATIONAL ADBOND		
			PHYSORBED MOLECULE		
			PHONONS		
			DEBYE SPECTRUM		
			ABSORPTION LINewidth		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) A theoretical study of the vibrational relaxation of the adbond between a physisorbed molecule and a crystalline substrate is presented. The bond between the admolecule and substrate is described as a one-dimensional Morse-oscillator. Using standard perturbation theory, expressions for the relaxation of the vibrational adbond due to its interaction with the substrate lattice vibrations are derived. Both energy relaxation and pure dephasing are considered. A numerical evaluation of the resulting expressions for the relaxation constants is given for a Debye spectrum for the phonons and for a surface phonon spectrum. The relative importance of pure dephasing and energy relaxation in determining the absorption linewidth is derived as a function of the fundamental frequency of the active mode.					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS <input type="checkbox"/>			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. David L. Nelson			22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) (202) 696-4410		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL

PURE DEPHASING OF A VIBRATIONAL ADBOND

Sander van Smaalen  
Laboratory of Inorganic Chemistry  
Materials Science Center  
University of Groningen  
Nijenborgh 16  
9747 AG Groningen  
The Netherlands.

Thomas F. George  
Departments of Chemistry and Physics & Astronomy  
239 Fronczak Hall  
State University of New York at Buffalo  
Buffalo, New York 14260



Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution /	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

ABSTRACT

A theoretical study of the vibrational relaxation of the adbond between a physisorbed molecule and a crystalline substrate is presented. The bond between the ad molecule and the substrate is described as a one-dimensional Morse-oscillator. Using standard perturbation theory, expressions for the relaxation of the vibrational adbond due to its interaction with the substrate lattice vibrations are derived. Both energy relaxation and pure dephasing are considered. A numerical evaluation of the resulting expressions for the relaxation constants is given for a Debye spectrum for the phonons and for a surface phonon spectrum. The relative importance of pure dephasing and energy relaxation in determining the absorption linewidth is derived as a function of the fundamental frequency of the active mode.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The effects of vibrational excitation of adsorbed molecules by an IR laser has been the subject of many experimental and theoretical studies over the past decade.<sup>1</sup> Primarily, the interest in laser excitation of an adspecies arose because of the prospect of influencing surface chemical reactions<sup>2</sup> and the prospect of selective laser-induced desorption without heating (i.e., damaging) the substrate.<sup>3</sup> Later it was shown that substrate heating via the adsorbate of an otherwise transparent crystal might quite well be the most important process occurring.<sup>4-8</sup>

Besides using the laser to influence particular processes, it can also be used as an analytical tool. Best known is the measurement of the absorption line profile and the line width. More modern examples are echo experiments and time-resolved transmission spectroscopy. With all these techniques some information can be obtained about the adbond or adsorbate and its interaction with the substrate.

Surface reactions are mainly dependent on the extent to which a particular vibrational mode can be excited and the speed with which relaxation occurs. Processes in which the populations of the vibrational levels are changed, due to an energy exchange with the reservoir, are generally called energy relaxation or  $T_1$ -processes.

The absorption lineshape is determined by the Fourier transform of the autocorrelation function of the dipole operator of the adbond. In particular, it involves the time evolution of the off-diagonal elements of the reduced density operator. In the most simplest approximation the absorption line is a

Lorentzian, with a width determined by two processes. The first, inhomogeneous broadening, arises due to inhomogeneities in the environment of the active molecules. For adsorbates, it can have contributions from differences in adsorption sites, roughness of the surface and other causes. Because the magnitude of these irregularities is not well known, inhomogeneous broadening is difficult to analyze in a first principles way. A phenomenological approach was recently given by Gortel et al.<sup>9</sup>

The second mechanism, homogeneous broadening, again consists of two parts: energy relaxation (or  $T_1$ - processes) and pure dephasing (or  $T_2^*$ - processes). The latter is the collection of all relaxation terms which contribute to the time evolution of the off-diagonal elements of the density operator, but which do not change the populations. In the simplest approximation the total homogeneous width is given by,

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{2}{T_1} + \frac{1}{T_2^*} \quad (1.1)$$

Each of these three relaxation times can in principle be determined experimentally. For adsorbates, the energy relaxation time was determined for chemisorbed OH on silica by time-resolved transmission spectroscopy.<sup>10,11</sup> The same experiments for the lower-frequency adbond mode of physisorbed systems have not been done yet. One problem there is the lack of an appropriate laser for these frequencies. Echo experiments give the total dephasing time (Eq. (1.1)). Together with the previous mentioned time resolved spectroscopy measurements, they can be used to determine the pure dephasing. Finally,

simple measurement of the absorption linewidth gives the combination of homogeneous and inhomogeneous broadening. Combined with the result for  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , it gives the contribution of inhomogeneous broadening.

The question we want to address in this paper is what the relative importance is of energy relaxation and pure dephasing, respectively, to the homogeneous linewidth.

Experimentally, we know from the  $T_1$ -measurements by Heilweil et al.<sup>10,11</sup> and previous determinations of the total linewidth<sup>12</sup> that the latter is not due to  $T_1$ -processes only. Whether the discrepancy has to be attributed to pure dephasing or to inhomogeneous broadening, cannot be deduced from these experiments. Measurements of the total linewidth for adsorbates have also been done for hydrogen on wolfram,<sup>13</sup> hydrogen on silicium,<sup>14</sup> and for the internal mode vibration of CO on nickel.<sup>15</sup> Theoretical arguments as well as detailed calculations have been given to show that these linewidth's are mainly due to pure dephasing.<sup>14-17</sup>

All the above indicated experiments and theoretical considerations are about the excitation/relaxation of the vibrational states of a chemical bond, with typically a frequency of  $2000\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Experiments of relaxation of molecules embedded in the solid state suggest that the line broadening is mainly due to pure dephasing. There is no reason to believe this to be different for similar modes of adsorbates.<sup>16</sup> The calculations in this paper will support these conclusions.

However, for physisorbed systems, the adbond mode will have a fundamental frequency in the region  $50 - 500\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , considerably lower than that of a chemical bond. For such low frequencies an experimental analysis is difficult



to perform. We are only aware of the measurement of the linewidth of the adbond vibration of CO on nickel.<sup>18</sup> Theoretical analysis has mainly been restricted to energy relaxation.<sup>19-21</sup> The question we want to answer in this paper is whether for these low-frequency modes pure dephasing still is the most important relaxation process. It will be shown that under certain conditions, dependent on both the adbond and on the details of the reservoir spectrum,  $T_1$ - and  $T_2^*$ -processes can become of equal importance, and energy relaxation can even become the more important one.

Following earlier work,<sup>19-22</sup> in the next section we shall present a theory of vibrational relaxation of an adbond, with the lattice vibrations of the substrate as a reservoir. However, we shall retain the terms describing pure dephasing, and we will derive explicit expressions for  $T_1$  and  $T_2^*$ . In Secs. 4 and 5, we shall evaluate these expressions numerically as a function of the fundamental frequency of the adbond vibrational mode. Finally, in Sec. 6 conclusions will be presented.

## 2. RELAXATION CONSTANTS

Consider a system of an atom or molecule physisorbed on a crystal. It is assumed that the bond between the adsorbate and substrate can be described as a one-dimensional anharmonic oscillator; only vibrations perpendicular to the surface are considered. Excitation of the adbond can be accomplished by laser light in resonance with one pair of vibrational states. Relaxation occurs through the dynamic coupling of the adbond with the lattice vibrations of the substrate. The latter is assumed to act as a thermal bath or reservoir.<sup>23</sup>

The potential energy between the adatom and the substrate is given by a one dimensional potential between the instantaneous position of the adatom,  $z$ , and of the nearest surface atom,  $u_z$  (Fig. 1),

$$V = V(z - z_0 - u_z) \quad . \quad (2.1)$$

The origin is chosen as the average position of the surface atom. The average of the instantaneous displacement  $u_z$  is therefore zero. It is assumed  $u_z$  is entirely determined by the lattice vibrations of the substrate (reservoir condition). Then the vibrations of the adatom are described by the Hamiltonian

$$H_a = - \frac{M^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dz^2} + \langle V(z - z_0 - u_z) \rangle \quad , \quad (2.2)$$

where  $m$  is the mass of the adatom and  $\langle \dots \rangle$  denotes the average over the substrate lattice vibrations. The interaction between the adatom and the lattice vibrations is given by

$$H^I = V(z - z_0 - u_z) - \langle V(z - z_0 - u_z) \rangle \quad (2.3)$$

Furthermore, we denote by  $H_p$  and  $\rho_p^0$ , respectively, the Hamiltonian and thermal equilibrium density operator of the harmonic lattice vibrations of the substrate. The eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the adatom Hamiltonian are defined by

$$H_a |n\rangle = \hbar \omega_n |n\rangle \quad (2.4)$$

The complete system has the Hamiltonian

$$H = H_0 + H^I = H_a + H_p + H^I \quad (2.5)$$

The state of this system is described by a density operator  $\rho$ , which obeys the equation of motion,

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H, \rho] \quad (2.6)$$

Then the adatom can be described by its reduced density operator

$$\sigma(t) = \text{Tr}_p \{ \rho(t) \} \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\text{Tr}_p$  denotes the trace over the phonon variables.

Following earlier work,<sup>19-22</sup> an approximate expression for the reduced density operator of the adbond can be derived as,

$$\frac{d\sigma(t)}{dt} = \frac{1}{iM} [H_a, \sigma(t)] - \frac{1}{M^2} \text{Tr}_p \int_0^t dt' [H^I, [\bar{H}^I(-t'), \rho_p^0 \sigma(t)]] \quad (2.8)$$

with

$$\bar{H}^I(-t') = \exp(-\frac{1}{M} H_0 t') H^I \exp(\frac{1}{M} H_0 t') \quad (2.9)$$

The first term of Eq. (2.8) defines the free evolution of the adbond while, the second term gives the relaxation. A further approximation can be made by neglecting terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (2.8) which oscillate with a frequency different from the free evolution of  $\sigma(t)$ . Within this approximation, usually denoted as the random-phase approximation (RPA), we obtain for the time derivative of the matrix elements of  $\sigma(t)$  between eigenstates of  $H_a$ ,

$$\frac{d\sigma_n(t)}{dt} = - \sum_n \Gamma_{nn}^{kk} \sigma_k(t) \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\frac{d\sigma_{nm}(t)}{dt} = -i \omega_{nm} \sigma_{nm}(t) - \Gamma_{nm}^{nm} \sigma_{nm}(t) \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\sigma_{nm}(t) = \langle n | \sigma(t) | m \rangle$ ,  $\sigma_n = \sigma_{nn}$  and  $\omega_{nm} = \omega_n - \omega_m$ . Let us define

$$a_{nk} = \frac{1}{M^2} \int_0^\infty dt' \{ \langle \tilde{H}_{nk}^I(0) \tilde{H}_{kn}^I(-t') \rangle + \langle \tilde{H}_{nk}^I(-t') \tilde{H}_{kn}^I(0) \rangle \} \quad (2.12a)$$

$$A_n = \sum_{k \neq n} \frac{1}{M^2} \int_0^\infty dt' \langle \tilde{H}_{nk}^I(0) \tilde{H}_{kn}^I(-t') \rangle \quad (2.12b)$$

$$F_{nm} = \frac{1}{M^2} \int_0^\infty dt' \{ \langle \tilde{H}_{nn}^I(0) \tilde{H}_{nn}^I(-t') \rangle + \langle \tilde{H}_{mm}^I(-t') \tilde{H}_{mm}^I(0) \rangle - \langle \tilde{H}_{mm}^I(0) \tilde{H}_{nn}^I(-t') \rangle - \langle \tilde{H}_{mm}^I(-t') \tilde{H}_{nn}^I(0) \rangle \} \quad (2.12c)$$

where  $\langle \hat{Q} \rangle = T_{rp} \{ \rho_p^0 \hat{Q} \}$  is the average of  $\hat{Q}$  over the phonon reservoir. Then the relaxation constants are given by

$$\Gamma_{nn}^{kk} = -a_{kn} \quad \text{for } n \neq k \quad (2.13a)$$

$$\Gamma_{nn}^{nn} = (A_n + A_n^*) \quad (2.13b)$$

$$\Gamma_{nm}^{nm} = \text{Re} \{ A_n + A_m^* + F_{nm} \} \quad (2.13c)$$

In the RPA, pure dephasing is given by the diagonal elements of the interaction Hamiltonian. From Eqs. (2.10)-(2.13) it follows that indeed they do not contribute to the time-evolution of the populations. They do influence the coherences, with a rate constant  $F_{nm}$  and the added the energy relaxation

rate constants  $\Lambda_n$ . A condition for pure dephasing to occur is that  $F_{nm}$  is nonzero. As can be deduced from Eq. (2.12c), this means that

$$\tilde{H}_{nn}^I = \tilde{H}_{mm}^I \text{ for } n \neq m \quad (2.14)$$

For example, it can be shown that Eq. (2.14) is not fulfilled when the complete system is described by harmonic oscillators. An expression similar to Eq. (2.12c) was given by Burns et al.<sup>24</sup>

In the rest of the paper we shall use the Morse potential for the interaction potential  $V(z-z_0-u_z)$ ,

$$V_m(z) = D[\exp(-2\alpha z) - 2 \exp(-\alpha z)] \quad (2.15)$$

The reasons are that a Morse potential gives a fair description of the van der Waals bond, and that it is to a large extent amenable to analytic evaluation of the expressions. The lattice vibrations are described as a set of harmonic oscillators. Then, following the work of Efrima et al.,<sup>19</sup> the correlation functions of the interaction Hamiltonian can be evaluated:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle H_{nm}^I(0) H_{kl}^I(-t') \rangle &= D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} e^{-i\omega_{kl} t'} \\ &+ B_{nm}^{(2)} B_{kl}^{(2)} \{ \exp(4\alpha^2 \langle u(0)u(-t') \rangle) - 1 \} \\ &+ 4 B_{nm}^{(2)} B_{kl}^{(1)} \{ \exp(\alpha^2 \langle u(0)u(-t') \rangle) - 1 \} \\ &- 2 B_{nm}^{(2)} B_{kl}^{(1)} \{ \exp(2\alpha^2 \langle u(0)u(-t') \rangle) - 1 \} \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

$$- 2 B_{nm}^{(1)} B_{kl}^{(2)} (\exp(2\alpha^2 \langle u(0)u(-t') \rangle) - 1) ,$$

where the displacement autocorrelation function is purely determined by the reservoir.  $B_{nm}^{(j)}$  is the matrix element of  $e^{-j\alpha(z-z'_0)}$  between the eigenstates of  $H_a$  (see the Appendix).

### 3. MULTIPHONON CONTRIBUTIONS

The Markov approximation implies a separation of the system in two parts, the reservoir and the subsystem of interest (adbond). Changes in the state of the complete system then have the interpretation of something changing in the adbond accompanied by a change in the reservoir. Within the RPA the time evolution of the reduced density operator of the adbond has a very simple interpretation (Eqs. (2.10) and (2.11)). Any change of  $\sigma(t)$  is accompanied by the creation or destruction of one or more phonons of the substrate.

For the Morse potential and a harmonic lattice, the  $n$ -phonon contribution to the relaxation constant is given by the combination of all terms involving the  $n$ -th power of the autocorrelation function of the surface atom displacement. Each of these terms is singled out easily by expanding the exponential functions in Eq. (2.16). For a Debye spectrum for the phonons, the importance of multiphonon contributions was analyzed by Jedrzejek et al.,<sup>25,26</sup> and up to  $n = 2$  by Gortel et al.<sup>27</sup> These authors considered only the master equation (Eqs. (2.10) and (2.15)), and therefore analyzed only the contributions of the multiphonon contributions to the transition rate constants  $a_{nk}$  (Eq. (2.12a)). It was found that for transitions between vibrational states involving energies less than the Debye frequency, the

single-phonon terms dominate. For transitions of energy higher than this Debye frequency, multiphonon terms are also important.

Especially for the motion perpendicular to the surface, i.e.,  $u_z$  the Debye spectrum is a poor presentation of the density of states (DOS) of the phonon spectrum.<sup>28</sup> Recently, the transition rate constants for the vibrational adbond of CO physisorbed on Ni were calculated by Volokitin et al.<sup>29</sup> using the more realistic surface phonon spectrum due to Black.<sup>28</sup> The values they obtained were much lower and in better agreement with experiment than these calculated with the Debye spectrum. Furthermore, it was found that multiphonon terms of high order still give a significant contribution to the rate constants.

Energy relaxation involves a change in energy of the adbond. The transition from level  $n$  to level  $m$  is accompanied by the creation/annihilation of a phonon, which is depicted in Fig. 2. Multiphonon transitions can be represented by adding one or more virtual adbond levels. Pure dephasing (Eq. (12c)) occurs due to processes in which the populations of the adbond do not change. These can be interpreted as virtual excitations of the adbond, which then returns to its original state. Obviously the minimum number of phonons necessary for such a virtual excitation is two (Fig. 3). Therefore, pure dephasing has only contributions from two-phonon and higher multiphonon processes.

From the notion that pure dephasing is at least a two-phonon process, and from the previous discussion, one expects that pure dephasing will become an important relaxation process whenever the multiphonon contributions to the transition rate constants are important. The analysis in the rest of the paper will support this hypothesis to a large extent, although it will also



be found that the intrinsic differences between pure dephasing and energy relaxation do influence their relative importance.

Let us denote the phonon density of states by  $\rho(\omega)$ , with

$$\int_0^{\infty} d\omega \rho(\omega) = 1 \quad (3.1)$$

Then, the displacement autocorrelation function is given by,

$$\langle u(0)u(-t') \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2M} \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \frac{\rho(\omega)}{\omega} \{ (\bar{n}(\omega)+1)e^{-i\omega t'} + \bar{n}(\omega)e^{i\omega t'} \} \quad (3.2)$$

with

$$\bar{n}(\omega) = (\exp(\hbar\omega/k_B T) - 1)^{-1} \quad (3.3)$$

which gives the number of phonons with frequency  $\omega$  as a function of the temperature  $T$ ;  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant.

With these definitions the two-phonon contribution to the pure dephasing rate constant becomes for a Morse potential (Eq. (2.12c)),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(F_{nm}) &= D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} \left( \frac{m-n}{k} \right)^2 \frac{4\pi}{M^2} \left( \frac{\alpha^2 \hbar}{2M} \right)^2 \\ &\times \int_0^{\infty} d\omega \left( \frac{\rho(\omega)}{\omega} \right)^2 \bar{n}(\omega) [\bar{n}(\omega) + 1] \quad (3.4) \end{aligned}$$

where  $D$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $k$  are defined in the Appendix. The imaginary part of the rate constants determines a level shift and will not be considered here.

The energy relaxation contribution to the absorption linewidth of a transition  $n \rightarrow m$  is given by  $\text{Re}(A_n + A_m^*) = \text{Re}(A_n^* + A_m)$  (Eq. (2.13c)).  $\text{Re}(A_n)$  can be written as (Eq. (2.12))

$$\text{Re}(A_n) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=n} a_{nl} \quad (3.5)$$

For the latter rate constants the 1-phonon contribution is

$$a_{nm}^{(1)} = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} (B_{nm}^{(1)})^2 (n-m)^2 \left(1 - \frac{n+m+1}{2k}\right)^2 \quad (3.6)$$

$$\frac{4\pi}{M^2} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 k}{2M}\right) \frac{\rho(|\omega_{nm}|)}{\omega_{nm}} [\bar{n}(\omega_{nm}) + 1]$$

The two-phonon energy relaxation is given by,

$$a_{nm}^{(2)} = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} (B_{nm}^{(1)})^2 \left\{ 2 + 8 \left| \frac{n(2k-n-1) - m(2k-m-1)}{2k} \right| \right. \\ \left. + 8 \left| \frac{n(2k-n-1) - m(2k-m-1)}{2k} \right|^2 \right\} \frac{\pi}{M^2} \left(\frac{M\alpha^2}{2M}\right)^2 \quad (3.7)$$

$$\times \int_0^\infty d\omega \left\{ \frac{\rho(\omega)}{\omega} \frac{\rho(\omega_{nm} - \omega)}{(\omega_{nm} - \omega)} [\bar{n}(\omega) + 1] [\bar{n}(\omega_{nm} - \omega) + 1] \right.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 & + \frac{\rho(\omega)}{\omega} \frac{\rho(\omega_{\text{ph}} - \omega)}{(\omega_{\text{ph}} - \omega)} \bar{n}(\omega) \bar{n}(\omega_{\text{ph}} - \omega) \\
 & + \frac{\rho(\omega)}{\omega} \frac{\rho(\omega_{\text{ph}} + \omega)}{(\omega_{\text{ph}} + \omega)} (\bar{n}(\omega) + 1) \bar{n}(\omega_{\text{ph}} + \omega) \\
 & + \frac{\rho(\omega)}{\omega} \frac{\rho(\omega - \omega_{\text{ph}})}{(\omega - \omega_{\text{ph}})} \bar{n}(\omega) (\bar{n}(\omega - \omega_{\text{ph}}) + 1) .
 \end{aligned}$$

The four terms in Eq. (3.7) correspond to the four two-phonon processes denoted by II-V in Figure 2.

From Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7) we can conclude that the energy relaxation constants strongly depend on the details of the phonon spectrum used. In particular, the single-phonon term is directly proportional to the DOS at the transition frequency. The pure dephasing constant is less dependent on the phonon spectrum because it involves an integral over the square of  $\rho(\omega)$ . In the next two sections we shall evaluate the expressions Eqs. (3.4), (3.6) and (3.7) for, respectively, a Debye spectrum and a DOS representing a surface phonon spectrum.

#### 4. DEBYE SPECTRUM

For a Debye spectrum we have

$$\rho(\omega) = \begin{cases} \frac{3\omega^2}{\omega_D^3} & \omega \leq \omega_D \\ 0 & \omega > \omega_D \end{cases} . \quad (4.1)$$

Let us define the integral

$$I_D(y) = \int_0^y dx \frac{x^2 e^x}{(e^x - 1)^2} \quad (4.2)$$

Then the two-phonon contribution to the pure dephasing for a Debye phonon spectrum can be written as,

$$\text{Re}(F_{nm}) = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} \left(\frac{m-n}{k}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{M}\right) 9\pi \frac{1}{\omega_D^3} \left(\frac{k_B T}{M\omega_D}\right)^3 I_D\left(\frac{M\omega_D}{k_B T}\right) \quad (4.3)$$

It is easy to show that  $I_D(y) = \text{constant} = 3.3$  for  $(y \rightarrow \infty)$ . Then we obtain  $\text{Re}(F_{nm}) = O(T^3)$  for  $T \rightarrow 0$ .

Substitution of Eq. (4.1) in Eq. (3.6) gives for the single-phonon energy relaxation

$$a_{nm}^{(1)} = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} (B_{nm}^{(1)})^2 (n-m)^2 \left(1 - \frac{n+m+1}{2k}\right) \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{M}\right) \quad (4.4)$$

$$\frac{6\pi}{M\omega_D^3} \omega_{nm} [1 + n(\omega_{nm})]$$

for  $\omega \leq \omega_D$ . For  $\omega > \omega_D$  we have  $a_{nm}^{(1)} = 0$ . The two-phonon contribution is (Eq. (3.7)),

$$a_{nm}^{(2)} = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} (B_{nm}^{(1)})^2 \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{M}\right)^2 \frac{9\pi}{4\omega_D^3} E\left(\frac{M\omega_D}{k_B T}; \frac{M\omega_{nm}}{k_B T}\right) \quad (4.5)$$

$$\times \{2 + 8 \left| \frac{n(2k-n-1) - m(2k-m-1)}{2k} \right| + 8 \left( \frac{n(2k-n-1) - m(2k-m-1)}{2k} \right)^2\} .$$

The expression for the integral E depends on the values of  $\omega_D$  and  $\omega_{nm}$ .

For  $|\omega_{nm}| > 2\omega_D$  we have

$$E(x_D ; x_{nm}) = 0 , \quad (4.6a)$$

For  $2\omega_D \geq \omega_{nm} \geq \omega_D$

$$E(x_D ; x_{nm}) = \int_{x_{nm}-x_D}^{x_D} dx \, x(x_{nm}-x) \frac{e^{x_{nm}}}{(e^x-1)(e^{x_{nm}-x}-1)} , \quad (4.6b)$$

and for  $\omega_D \geq \omega_{nm} \geq 0$

$$E(x_D ; x_{nm}) = \int_0^{x_{nm}} dx \, x(x_{nm}-x) \frac{e^{x_{nm}}}{(e^x-1)(e^{x_{nm}-x}-1)} + 2 \int_{x_{nm}}^{x_D} dx \, x(x-x_{nm}) \frac{e^x}{(e^x-1)(e^{x-x_{nm}}-1)} , \quad (4.6c)$$

with similar expressions for  $\omega_{nm} < 0$ .

For  $T \rightarrow 0$ ,  $x_D^{-3} E(x_D, x_{nm})$  converges to a limiting value. This means that at low temperature all n-phonon contributions to the energy relaxation remain finite. Therefore, in the limit  $T \rightarrow 0$ , energy relaxation will always dominate pure dephasing.

We are interested in an estimate of the different contributions to the total relaxation rate Eq. (2.13c). In order to do this we shall use values for the parameters which represent realistic systems like Ar/KCl and CO/Ni. That is, we use a number of adbond levels  $k = 25$ . Different systems, i.e., with a different fundamental frequency, are then represented by choosing different values for both  $\alpha$  and  $D$ , such that  $k = 25$ . The values for  $\mu$  and  $M$  are taken in accordance with the system CO/Cu.<sup>26</sup> In the low-temperature limit,  $x_D < 1$ , the energy relaxation rate constant  $Re(A_1 + A_0)$  for the  $1 \rightarrow 0$  transition can be approximated by  $\frac{1}{2}a_{10}$ . Also, for the  $1 \rightarrow 0$  transition ( $n, m \ll k$ ), the  $n, m$ -dependent factors have a simple approximate expression. With these substitutions and approximations, the relaxation constants become

$$F_{10}^{(2)} = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} \left(\frac{1}{k}\right)^2 \frac{9\pi}{\omega_D^3} \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{M}\right)^2 \frac{3.3}{x_D^3} \quad (4.7a)$$

$$Re(A_1^{(1)} + A_0^{(1)}) = \frac{1}{2} a_{10}^{(1)} = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} \frac{1}{2k} \frac{6\pi}{\omega_D^3} \frac{\alpha^2}{M} \frac{\omega_{10}}{M} \quad (4.7b)$$

For  $2\omega_D \geq \omega_{10} \geq \omega_D$  we have

$$Re(A_1^{(2)} + A_0^{(2)}) = \frac{1}{2} a_{10}^{(2)} = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} \frac{1}{2k} \frac{9\pi}{\omega_D^3} \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{M}\right)^2 \frac{9}{8} \quad (4.7c)$$

$$\times \left( \left(\frac{x_{10}}{x_D}\right)^2 \left(2 - \frac{x_{10}}{x_D}\right) - \frac{1}{3} \left(2 - \frac{x_{10}}{x_D}\right)^3 \right),$$

and for  $\omega_D \geq \omega_{10} \geq \omega$

$$\text{Re}(A_1^{(2)} + A_0^{(2)}) = D^2 e^{-2\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle} \frac{1}{2k} \frac{9\pi}{3} \left(\frac{a}{M}\right)^2 \frac{9}{12} \left(\frac{x_{10}}{x_d}\right)^3 . \quad (4.7d)$$

It is noted that for  $\omega_{10} > \omega_D$ ,  $a_{10}^{(1)} = 0$ , and that for  $\omega_{10} > 2\omega_D$ ,  $a_{10}^{(2)} = 0$ , but that the pure dephasing constant is only weakly dependent on the fundamental frequency.

From Eq. (4.7) the following estimates of the relative importance of the various contributions at low temperature can be made for  $0 < \omega_{10} < \omega_D$ :

$$\frac{F_{10}^{(2)}}{\frac{1}{2}a_{10}^{(1)}} = \frac{1}{30} \frac{1}{x_D^3} \quad (4.8a)$$

$$\frac{F_{10}^{(2)}}{\frac{1}{2}a_{10}^{(2)}} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{x_{nm}^3} . \quad (4.8b)$$

For  $\omega_D < \omega_{10} < 2\omega_D$ , the single-phonon energy relaxation is identically zero, but Eq. (4.8b) remains valid.

From Eq. (4.8), it follows that, for a Debye spectrum, the pure dephasing rate constant is much smaller than the single-phonon energy relaxation, and of about the same magnitude as the two-phonon energy relaxation. The two-phonon contribution to the energy relaxation is much smaller than the single-phonon term, and the three-phonon term will again be an order of magnitude smaller than the two-phonon term. Therefore, when compared to three-phonon or higher-order terms in the energy relaxation rate constant, the pure dephasing will be the most important relaxation process.

## 5. SURFACE PHONON SPECTRUM

In the model used in this paper, the coupling between the adbond and the phonon reservoir is mediated by the motion of the surface atom perpendicular to the surface. Especially for this direction of the motion, the theoretical calculations of Black<sup>28</sup> for a Ni(111) surface show a large difference in the spectrum of the surface phonons compared to that of the bulk phonons. The most prominent characteristic of this spectrum is that the DOS consists of a single peak at frequency  $\omega_0 = 24.2$  THz. Besides this peak, there is some extra density in the tails between frequencies of  $60 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $300 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  (as visible in the picture given by Black). We want to evaluate the expressions for the relaxation constants for such a phonon density of states. In order to do this, we approximate the calculated spectrum by the simple analytical form

$$\rho(\omega) = \frac{\ln 2}{2\omega_0^2 \Delta} \omega^2 \exp(-|\omega_0 - \omega| \ln 2 / \Delta) \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\Delta = 1.45 \text{ THz} = \frac{1}{2} \text{FWHM}$ . The  $\omega^2$ -dependence is chosen in order to obtain the correct limiting behavior for  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ; the exponential gives a reasonable representation of the spectrum calculated by Black.

Again, we consider the  $1 \rightarrow 0$  transition in the low-temperature limit. Substitution of the DOS (Eq. (5.1)) into Eqs. (3.4), (3.6) and (3.7) gives the required rate constants. After rearrangement they become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\omega_0} \text{Re}(a_{nm}^{(1)}) &= \left(\frac{\omega_{nm}}{\omega_0}\right)^4 \left(\frac{\pi}{M}\right) \left(\frac{\omega_0}{\Delta}\right) \exp(-\ln 2 \left|1 - \frac{\omega_{nm}}{\omega_0}\right| \frac{\omega_0}{\Delta}) \\ &= 2\pi \ln 2 (B_{nm}^{(1)})^2 \left(1 - \frac{n+m+1}{2k}\right)^2 k^4 / (|n-m| (2k-n-m-1)^3) \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$



$$\frac{1}{\omega_0} \operatorname{Re}(a_{nm}^{(2)}) = \left(\frac{\omega_{nm}}{\omega_0}\right)^4 \left(\frac{\pi}{M}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\omega_0}{\Delta}\right)^2 I_S\left(\frac{\omega_{nm}}{\omega_0}\right) (B_{nm}^{(1)})^2 \quad (5.3)$$

$$\times \frac{1}{2} \pi (\ln(2))^2 \left(\frac{k}{|n-m|(2k-n-m-1)}\right)^2 \left\{1 + 2 \left(\frac{k}{|n-m|(2k-n-m-1)}\right) + \left(\frac{k}{|n-m|(2k-n-m-1)}\right)^2\right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\omega_0} \operatorname{Re}(F_{nm}) &= \left(\frac{\omega_{nm}}{\omega_0}\right)^4 \left(\frac{\mu}{M}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\omega_0}{\Delta}\right)^2 \pi (\ln 2)^2 \frac{k^2}{(2k-n-m-1)^4 (m-n)^2} \\ &\times \int_0^{\infty} dz z^2 \exp(-2 \ln 2 |1-z| \omega_0 / \Delta) \left(\exp\left(\frac{z M \omega_0}{k_B T}\right) - 1\right)^{-1} \\ &- \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{z M \omega_0}{k_B T}\right)\right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where  $z = \omega/\omega_0$ , and  $I_S(\frac{\omega_{nm}}{\omega_0})$  is given by

$$I_S(x) = \frac{1}{6} x^3 \exp(-\ln 2 (2-x) \omega_0 / \Delta) \quad (5.5a)$$

for  $x \leq 1$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} I_S(x) &= \left\{2x \left(\frac{\Delta}{\omega_0 2 \ln 2}\right)^2 - 4 \left(\frac{\Delta}{\omega_0 2 \ln 2}\right)^3\right\} \exp(-\ln(2)x \omega_0 / \Delta) \\ &+ \left\{2(x-1) \left(\frac{\Delta}{\omega_0 2 \ln 2}\right) - 4 \left(\frac{\Delta}{\omega_0 2 \ln 2}\right)^3 - 2|x-2| \left(\frac{\Delta}{\omega_0 2 \ln 2}\right)^2\right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.5b)$$

$$\pm \left( \frac{2}{3} - x + \frac{1}{6} x^3 \right) \exp(-\ln 2 |2-x| \omega_0/\Delta)$$

for  $x \geq 1$ . The plus sign applies for  $x \geq 2$  and the minus sign for  $1 \leq x \leq 2$  ( $x = \omega_{nm}/\omega_0$ ). It follows that the energy relaxation rate constants are, in this low-temperature approximation, independent of the temperature. Pure dephasing is strongly temperature dependent, through the exponential functions.

The Morse potential parameters representing some real physisorbed systems are such that the number of levels,  $k$ , is more or less constant.<sup>26</sup> To compare the energy relaxation and pure dephasing, we plot in Fig. 4 the relaxation constants as a function of the fundamental frequency,  $\omega_{10}$ , of the vibrational adbond. The constants defining the adbond ( $k, \mu, M$ ) are the same as those used in Sec. 4.

All quantities are given in units of the characteristic frequency  $\omega_0$  of the phonon spectrum. We see that, as expected, the  $n$ -phonon energy relaxation rate constant has a maximum at frequency  $n\omega_0$ . For  $\omega_{10} = \omega_0$  it decreases exponentially with  $|\omega_{10} - \omega_0|$ . The pure dephasing constant is much less dependent on the transition frequency. The largest effect is due to the increase of  $\frac{d^2 V(z-z_0)}{dz^2} \Big|_{z=z_0}$  with increasing  $\omega_{10}$ , and not to a resonance effect as for the energy relaxation.

It is to be expected that the maxima in  $a_{10}^{(n)}$  will gradually decrease with increasing  $n$ . Then, for transition frequencies larger than  $n\omega_0$  with  $n$  on the order 3 or 4, pure dephasing will become a more important process than energy relaxation. A notable difference with the Debye spectrum is that the single-phonon and two-phonon contributions to the energy relaxation are still larger than the pure dephasing even if  $\omega_{10} > n\omega_0$  ( $n = 1, 2$ , respectively). For the

Debye spectrum the  $n$ -phonon term is exactly zero for  $\omega_{10} > n\omega_D$ . This is due to  $\rho(\omega)$  now being non-zero for  $\omega > \omega_D$ . Therefore, the precise behaviour of  $a_{10}^{(n)}$  for  $\omega_{10} > n\omega_D$  depends strongly on the exact form of  $\rho(\omega)$ . Since the difference between the calculated spectrum<sup>28</sup> and a Lorentzian peak (used here) or, for example, a Gaussian function cannot be seen for  $\omega \geq 2\omega_D$ , the values of the  $n$ -phonon relaxation constants beyond  $\omega_{10} = (n+1)\omega_D$  are not reliable, and no conclusion should be drawn regarding their behavior at those frequencies.

## 6. DISCUSSION

It is well known that pure dephasing is a relaxation process which is due to anharmonicities in the system. In the model used in this paper, anharmonicity is introduced in the active mode (vibrational adbond), and its magnitude is fixed by the choice of a Morse potential to represent this bond. Another approach can be to take into account the anharmonicity in lattice vibrations.<sup>6</sup> We assume that this can be neglected with respect to the effect of the adbond anharmonicity. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that the calculations presented here and elsewhere<sup>17,31</sup> give values for the pure dephasing constants which can be strongly model dependent. Energy relaxation is already present in a harmonic system and does not change dramatically upon introducing anharmonicity.

It is found that for low temperature the pure dephasing constant goes to zero as  $T^3$  ( $T \rightarrow 0$ ) (Eqs. (4.7) and (5.4); see also Ref. 17). Apparently this result does not depend on the details of the phonon spectrum. It does depend on the kind of relaxation process studied, i.e., on the form of the coupling between the active mode and lattice vibrations. This can be compared to the

results of Skinner and Hsu who find a  $T^7$ -dependence for the relaxation of the electronic excitation of a molecule embedded in a crystal.<sup>31</sup>

The calculations presented in Secs. 3-5 clearly show that resonance is an important effect in determining the magnitude of the energy relaxation rate constants (Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7)). The n-phonon contribution is large whenever all phonons involved are of a frequency at which the DOS is large. For the Debye spectrum this means that the n-phonon term has a maximum for the transition frequency smaller but of the order  $n\omega_D$ . For  $\omega_{10} > n\omega_D$ , that term is identically zero. For the surface phonon spectrum, each n-phonon term in the rate constant has a maximum at  $n\omega_0$  and decreases strongly for  $|\omega_{10} - n\omega_0| \neq 0$ . The results also show that on going to a higher multiphonon process, the maximum value of the relaxation constant decreases with increasing n (see also Refs. 25-27).

The lowest-order contribution to the pure dephasing is a two-phonon process. Because it involves only a single adbond level, the resonance effect is now that the largest contribution to the relaxation constant comes from virtual excitations with frequency  $\omega_0$ . Since there are no other restrictions on the position of the virtual level, the relaxation constant will hardly depend on the fundamental frequency. Its magnitude should therefore be of the order of the two-phonon energy relaxation term at its maximum. On the other hand, it will roughly be lower by a factor of  $\bar{n}(\omega_0)$  than this term, because it also involves the absorption of a phonon. It is this factor which introduces the strong temperature dependence of the pure dephasing (Fig. 4).

This analysis shows that at high temperatures, where  $\bar{n}(\omega_D)$  or  $\bar{n}(\omega_0) > 1$ , the two-phonon pure dephasing term will be of the order of the maximum value of the two-phonon energy relaxation term. For lower temperature ( $\bar{n}(\omega_0)$ ,  $\bar{n}(\omega_D)$

< 1), the two-phonon pure dephasing will be somewhat smaller. Then, one expects pure dephasing to be the most important relaxation process when the transition frequency of the active mode is much larger than the characteristic frequency ( $\omega_0$  or  $\omega_D$ ) of the phonon reservoir. This is in accordance with the result of Gadzuk and Luntz<sup>16</sup> and Hutchinson and George,<sup>17</sup> who considered the relaxation of an internal vibrational mode of an adsorbed molecule. Although the coupling mechanism is different there, the conclusions are also valid for the relaxation of an electronic excitation.<sup>31</sup> However, for the low-frequency adbond vibrations of a physisorbed molecule, the energy relaxation is mainly due to single-phonon and/or two-phonon contributions. Then energy relaxation will give the largest contribution.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFSC), United States Air Force, under Contract F49620-86-C-0009. The United States Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints notwithstanding any copyright notation hereon. The research of S. van Smaalen has been made possible by a fellowship of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

## REFERENCES

1. T. J. Chuang, Surf. Sci. Rep. 3, 1 (1983).
2. M. S. Djidjoev, R. V. Khoklov, A. V. Kiselev, V. I. Lygin, V. A. Namiot, A. I. Osipov, V. I. Panchenko and B. I. Provotorov, in Tunable lasers and Applications, edited by A. Moordadian, T. Jaeger, P. Stokseth (Springer, Berlin, 1976), p. 100ff.
3. M. S. Slutsky and T. F. George, Chem. Phys. Lett. 57, 474 (1978).
4. J. Heidberg, H. Stein and E. Riehl, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 666 (1982).
5. I. Hussla, H. Seki, T. J. Chuang, Z. W. Gortel, H. J. Kreuzer and P. Piercy, Phys. Rev. B 32, 3489 (1985).
6. K. Veeken, P. A. M. van der Heide, L. M. ten Dam, A. R. de Vroomen and J. Reuss, Surf. Sci. 166, 1 (1986).
7. Z. W. Gortel, H. J. Kreuzer, P. Piercy and R. Teshima, Phys. Rev. B 28, 2119 (1983).
8. S. van Smaalen, H. F. Arnoldus and T. F. George, Phys. Rev. B 35, 1142 (1987).

9. Z. W. Gortel, P. Piercy, R. Teshima and H. J. Kreuzer, *Surf. Sci.* 165, L12 (1986).
10. E. J. Heilwell, M. P. Casassa, R. R. Cavanagh and J. C. Stephenson, *J. Chem. Phys.* 82, 5216 (1985).
11. E. J. Heilwell, M. P. Casassa, R. R. Cavanagh and J. C. Stephenson, *J. Chem. Phys.* 85, 5004 (1986).
12. H. P. Boehm, and H. Knözinger, in Catalysis: Science and Technology, edited by J. R. Anderson and M. Boudart (Springer, Berlin, 1983).
13. Y.J. Chabal and A.J. Sievers, *Phys. Rev. B*, 24, 2921 (1981).
14. J.C. Tully, Y.J. Chabal, K. Raghavachari, J.M. Bowman and R.R. Lucchese, *Phys. Rev. B*, 31, 1184 (1985).
15. B.N.J. Persson and R. Ryberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 54, 2119 (1985).
16. J. W. Gadzuk and A. C. Luntz, *Surf. Sci.* 144, 429 (1984).
17. M. Hutchinson and T. F. George, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 124, 211 (1986).
18. S. Chiang, R.G. Tobin, P.L. Richards and P.A. Thiel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 52, 648 (1984).

19. S. Efrima, C. Jedrzejek, K. F. Freed, E. Hood and H. Metiu, J. Chem. Phys. 79, 2436 (1983).
20. B. Fain and S. H. Lin, Surf. Sci. 147, 497 (1984).
21. H. F. Arnoldus, S. van Smaalen, and T. F. George, Phys. Rev. B 34, 6902 (1986).
22. Z. W. Cortel, H. J. Kreuzer, P. Piercy and R. Teshima, Phys. Rev. B 27, 5066 (1983).
23. W. H. Louisell, Quantum Statistical Properties of Radiation (Wiley, New York, 1973).
24. M. J. Burns, W. K. Liu and A. H. Zewail, in Spectroscopy and Excitation Dynamics of Condensed Molecular Systems, Vol. 4, edited by V. M. Agranovich and R. M. Hochstrasser, Modern Problems in Condensed Matter Sciences (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983), p. 305ff.
25. C. Jedrzejek, K. F. Freed, S. Efrima and H. Metiu, Chem. Phys. Lett. 74, 227 (1981).
26. E. Hood, C. Jedrzejek, K. F. Freed and H. Metiu, J. Chem. Phys. 81, 3277 (1984).
27. Z. W. Cortel, H. J. Kreuzer and R. Teshima, Phys. Rev. B 22, 512 (1980).



28. J. E. Black, Surf. Sci. 105, 59 (1981).
29. A. I. Volokitin, D. M. Braun and V. M. Yakovlev, Surf. Sci. 172, 31 (1986).
30. W. H. Hesselink and D. A. Wiersma, in Ref. 20, p. 249.
31. J. L. Skinner and D. Hsu, Adv. Chem. Phys. 65, 1 (1986).
32. J. A. Beswick and J. Jortner, J. Chem. Phys. 68, 2277 (1978).

APPENDIX: Matrix Element  $B_{nm}^{(j)}$

The Morse potential is given by

$$V_{\square}(z-z_0) = D(\exp(-2\alpha(z-z_0)) - 2 \exp(-\alpha(z-z_0))) \quad . \quad (A1)$$

Averaging  $V(z-z_0-u)$  over the lattice vibrations (i.e., over  $u$ ) results in again a Morse potential,

$$\langle V_{\square}(z-z_0-u) \rangle = V'_{\square}(z-z'_0) \quad , \quad (A2)$$

with renormalized parameters

$$D' = D \exp(-\alpha^2 \langle u^2 \rangle)$$

$$\alpha' = \alpha \quad (A3)$$

$$z'_0 = z_0 + \frac{3}{2} \alpha \langle u^2 \rangle \quad .$$

The adbond Hamiltonian is defined with the renormalized Morse potential as potential energy. Let us its discrete eigenfunctions by  $|n\rangle$ . Then the corresponding eigenvalues are

$$E_n = - \frac{\hbar^2 \alpha'^2}{2\mu} \left( k - n - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \quad , \quad (A4)$$

where

$$k = \frac{(2\mu D')^{1/2}}{\hbar\alpha} \quad (A5)$$

The integer part of  $k$  represents the number of bound states. From Eq. (A4) one directly obtains the fundamental frequency

$$\omega_{10} = \frac{\hbar^2 \alpha^2}{\mu} (k-1) \quad (A6)$$

The following matrix elements can be calculated as<sup>19,32</sup>

$$B_{nm}^{(1)} = \langle n | e^{-\alpha(z-z'_0)} | m \rangle = \frac{1}{2k} \left\{ \frac{(2k-2n-1)(2k-2m-1)}{n!m! \Gamma(2k-n) \Gamma(2k-m)} \right\}^{1/2} \Gamma(n+1) \Gamma(2k-m) \quad (A7)$$

$$B_{nm}^{(2)} = \langle n | \exp(-2\alpha(z-z'_0)) | m \rangle = B_{nm}^{(1)} \left( \frac{n(2k-n-1) - m(2k-m-1) + 2k}{2k} \right) \quad (A8)$$

both for  $n > (m-1)$ .

We need the matrix elements of the interaction Hamiltonian (Eq. (2.12)). Substitution of the explicit form of  $H^I$  (Eq. (2.3)) shows that this involves matrix elements of  $\exp[-j\alpha(z-z_0)]$ , for  $j = 1, 2$ . That is, we need matrix elements of both terms of the Morse potential (Eq. (A1)) between the eigenstates of the renormalized Morse potential (Eqs. (A2) and (A3)). We note that  $\exp[-j\alpha(z-z_0)] = \exp[-j\alpha(z-z'_0)] \exp[-j\alpha(z'_0-z_0)]$ , and that  $(z'_0-z_0) = \frac{3}{2}\alpha\langle u^2 \rangle$  is constant. Then from Eqs. (A7) and (A8) we immediately obtain the result

$$B_{nm}^{(j)} = \langle n | \exp(-j\alpha(z-z_0)) | m \rangle = e^{-j\frac{3}{2}\alpha^2\langle u^2 \rangle} B_{nm}^{(j)} \quad (A9)$$

with  $j = 1, 2$ .

This result was used in the evaluation of Eq. (2.16). We stress that the correction so obtained (Eq. (A9) versus Eqs. (A7) and (A8)) is of the same order of magnitude as the corrections obtained directly from using the renormalized Morse potential instead of  $V_{\square}(z-z_0)$  itself in  $H_{\square}$ .

#### FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Schematic drawing of an adsorbed atom at position  $z$  above a surface.

The nearest surface atom has a time-dependent displacement  $u$  perpendicular to the surface.

Figure 2. The single-phonon and two-phonon contributions to the energy relaxation for the transition from level  $n$  to level  $m$ , with  $\omega_n > \omega_m$ . Each arrow denotes the absorption (upwards) or emission (downwards) of a phonon. The energy of each phonon follows from the length of the arrow. The dotted lines indicate virtual adbond levels. I is the single-phonon process, and there are four two-phonon processes indicated by II-IV. For the downward transition  $n \rightarrow m$ , process III is not possible, and for the reverse upward transition, process II does not contribute.

Figure 3. Multiphonon contributions to pure dephasing. Depicted are both two-phonon processes and one three-phonon process. For the meaning of the symbols see Fig. 2. Note that pure dephasing terms involve only one (real) level of the adbond, and that single-phonon processes are impossible.

Figure 4. The logarithm of the various  $n$ -phonon contributions to the relaxation constants versus the fundamental frequency of the vibration. The low-temperature approximation is used (Eqs. (5.2)-(5.4)). All quantities are given in units of the characteristic frequency of the surface phonon spectrum. The pure dephasing,  $F_{10}^{(2)}$ .

is plotted for two values of the temperature. Note that the low-  
temperature approximation does not make sense for  $\frac{\omega_{10}}{\omega_0} < \frac{k_B T}{\hbar \omega_0}$ .

Fig. 1




Fig. 2







Fig. 3





TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 1113 800 M. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217-5000	2	Dr. David Young Code 334 NORDA NSTL, Mississippi 39529	1
Dr. Bernard Douda Naval Weapons Support Center Code 50C Crane, Indiana 47522-5050	1	Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. Ron Atkins Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555	1
Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko, Code L52 Port Hueneme, California 93401	1	Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps Code RD-1 Washington, D.C. 20380	1
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12 high quality	U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	1
DTNSRDC Attn: Dr. H. Singerman Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401	1	Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112	1
Dr. William Tolles Superintendent Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375-5000	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 92132	1
		Dr. David L. Nelson Chemistry Division Office of Naval Research 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	1

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. J. E. Jensen  
Hughes Research Laboratory  
3011 Malibu Canyon Road  
Malibu, California 90265

Dr. C. B. Harris  
Department of Chemistry  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. J. H. Weaver  
Department of Chemical Engineering  
and Materials Science  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. F. Kutzler  
Department of Chemistry  
Box 5055  
Tennessee Technological University  
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Dr. A. Reisman  
Microelectronics Center of North Carolina  
Research Triangle Park, North Carolina  
27709

Dr. D. DiLella  
Chemistry Department  
George Washington University  
Washington D.C. 20052

Dr. M. Grunze  
Laboratory for Surface Science and  
Technology  
University of Maine  
Orono, Maine 04469

Dr. R. Reeves  
Chemistry Department  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. J. Butler  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 6115  
Washington D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. Steven M. George  
Stanford University  
Department of Chemistry  
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. L. Interante  
Chemistry Department  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. Mark Johnson  
Yale University  
Department of Chemistry  
New Haven, CT 06511-8118

Dr. Irvin Heard  
Chemistry and Physics Department  
Lincoln University  
Lincoln University, Pennsylvania 19352

Dr. W. Knauer  
Hughes Research Laboratory  
3011 Malibu Canyon Road  
Malibu, California 90265

Dr. K.J. Klaubunde  
Department of Chemistry  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. G. A. Somorjai  
Department of Chemistry  
University of California  
Berkeley, California 94720

Dr. J. Murday  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Code 6170  
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. J. B. Hudson  
Materials Division  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. Theodore E. Madey  
Surface Chemistry Section  
Department of Commerce  
National Bureau of Standards  
Washington, D.C. 20234

Dr. J. E. Demuth  
IBM Corporation  
Thomas J. Watson Research Center  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Dr. M. G. Lagally  
Department of Metallurgical  
and Mining Engineering  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Dr. R. P. Van Duyne  
Chemistry Department  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois 60637

Dr. J. M. White  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Texas  
Austin, Texas 78712

Dr. D. E. Harrison  
Department of Physics  
Naval Postgraduate School  
Monterey, California 93940

Dr. R. L. Park  
Director, Center of Materials  
Research  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. W. T. Peria  
Electrical Engineering Department  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Dr. Keith H. Johnson  
Department of Metallurgy and  
Materials Science  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Dr. S. Sibener  
Department of Chemistry  
James Franck Institute  
5640 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dr. Arnold Green  
Quantum Surface Dynamics Branch  
Code 3817  
Naval Weapons Center  
China Lake, California 93555

Dr. A. Wold  
Department of Chemistry  
Brown University  
Providence, Rhode Island 02912

Dr. S. L. Bernasek  
Department of Chemistry  
Princeton University  
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

Dr. W. Kohn  
Department of Physics  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, California 92037

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. F. Carter  
Code 6170  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. Richard Colton  
Code 6170  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. Dan Pierce  
National Bureau of Standards  
Optical Physics Division  
Washington, D.C. 20234

Dr. R. Stanley Williams  
Department of Chemistry  
University of California  
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. R. P. Messmer  
Materials Characterization Lab.  
General Electric Company  
Schenectady, New York 22217

Dr. Robert Gomer  
Department of Chemistry  
James Franck Institute  
5640 Ellis Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dr. Ronald Lee  
R301  
Naval Surface Weapons Center  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dr. Paul Schoen  
Code 6190  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. John T. Yates  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

Dr. Richard Greene  
Code 5230  
Naval Research Laboratory  
Washington, D.C. 20375-5000

Dr. L. Kesmodel  
Department of Physics  
Indiana University  
Bloomington, Indiana 47403

Dr. K. C. Janda  
University of Pittsburgh  
Chemistry Building  
Pittsburg, PA 15260

Dr. E. A. Irene  
Department of Chemistry  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Dr. Adam Heller  
Bell Laboratories  
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974

Dr. Martin Fleischmann  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Southampton  
Southampton SO9 5NH  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. H. Tachikawa  
Chemistry Department  
Jackson State University  
Jackson, Mississippi 39217

Dr. John W. Wilkins  
Cornell University  
Laboratory of Atomic and  
Solid State Physics  
Ithaca, New York 14853

ABSTRACTS DISTRIBUTION LIST, 056/625/629

Dr. R. G. Wallis  
Department of Physics  
University of California  
Irvine, California 92664

Dr. D. Ramaker  
Chemistry Department  
George Washington University  
Washington, D.C. 20052

Dr. J. C. Hemminger  
Chemistry Department  
University of California  
Irvine, California 92717

Dr. T. F. George  
Chemistry Department  
University of Rochester  
Rochester, New York 14627

Dr. G. Rubloff  
IBM  
Thomas J. Watson Research Center  
P.O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Dr. Horia Metiu  
Chemistry Department  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. W. Goddard  
Department of Chemistry and Chemical  
Engineering  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California 91125

Dr. P. Hansma  
Department of Physics  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, California 93106

Dr. J. Baldeschwieler  
Department of Chemistry and  
Chemical Engineering  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California 91125

Dr. J. T. Keiser  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Richmond  
Richmond, Virginia 23173

Dr. R. W. Plummer  
Department of Physics  
University of Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dr. E. Yeager  
Department of Chemistry  
Case Western Reserve University  
Cleveland, Ohio 44106

Dr. N. Winograd  
Department of Chemistry  
Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Dr. Roald Hoffmann  
Department of Chemistry  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York 14853

Dr. A. Steckl  
Department of Electrical and  
Systems Engineering  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute  
Troy, New York 12181

Dr. G.H. Morrison  
Department of Chemistry  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, New York 14853

END

11-87

DTIC